

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 14-16, 29, 31-36 and 39-52 are pending in the application. Claims 42, 43, 48 and 49 are objected to. Claims 1-11, 14-16, 29, 31-36, 39-41, 44-47 and 50-52 stand rejected. This amendment cancels claims 1, 36, 39, and 45; amends Claims 2-11, 14, 31-35, 40-42, 44, 46-48, 50, and 52; and adds Claims 53-56; leaving Claims 2-11, 14-16, 29, 31-35, 40-44, and 46-56 remaining in the application.

Claims 42, 43, 48 and 49 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 42 and 48 have been so rewritten. Claim 43 and 49 are allowable as depending from Claims 42 and 48, respectively.

Claims 1, 2-4, 6, 9, 10, 31-33, 35, 36, 39, 41, 45 and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sano (US 5,739,924). Claims 5 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sano in view of Shiota et al. (US 6,011,547). Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sano in view of Feldis, III (US 2003/0007078). Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sano in view of Silverbrook (US 6,727,951). Claims 11 and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sano. Claims 29 and 50-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sano in view of Maruyama et al. (US 5,323,203). Claim 44 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sano. Claims 40 and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sano in view of Feldis, III in view of Silverbrook (US 6,727,951).

Claims 39 and 45 were cancelled as being redundant. Claims 1 and 36 were also cancelled and Claims 53 and 55 added.

Claim 53 states:

53. A method for processing a captured image, said method comprising the steps of:
collecting meta data related to the captured image;
calculating intermediate parameter values using said meta data;

computing predictions of a plurality of different perceived quality reducing defects in the captured image, at least one of said predictions using both said meta data and said intermediate parameter values, and said plurality of defects being exclusive of scene balance; adjusting scene balance of the captured image independent of said predictions; and applying one or more of a plurality of different correction processes on the captured image responsive to said predictions.

Claim 53 is supported and allowable on the same basis as Claim 42.

Added Claim 54 states:

54. The method of claim 53 wherein said intermediate parameter values quantify one or more of: degree of exposure of subject, normal exposure light level, degree of exposure of background, flash exposure ratio, ambient exposure ratio, angular magnification of the subject, final image viewing distance, maximum handheld shutter time, and display size factor.

Claim 54 is supported on the same basis as Claim 43 and by the application as filed (degree of exposure of subject (EQ. 4-5), normal exposure light level (EQ. 6), degree of exposure of background (EQ. 7-8), flash exposure ratio (EQ. 9), ambient exposure ratio (EQ. 10), angular magnification of the subject (EQ. 11), final image viewing distance (EQ. 12), maximum handheld shutter time (EQ. 13), and display size factor (EQ. 14)). Claim 54 is allowable as depending from Claim 53.

Claims 55-56 are supported and allowable on the same grounds as Claims 53-54.

The remaining claims were amended, as necessary, to depend from above-discussed independent claims.

Claims 2-11 and 14-16 were amended to depend from and, as necessary, to conform with the language of Claim 53 and are allowable on that basis.

Claim 50, which was rewritten as a dependent claim, and Claims 29, 40-41, 44, and 51 are allowable as depending from Claim 42.

Claim 52, which was rewritten as a dependent claim, and Claim 46-47 and 49 are allowable as depending from Claim 48.

It is believed that these changes now make the claims clear and definite and, if there are any problems with these changes, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 30,700

Robert Luke Walker/amb
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (585) 588-2739
Facsimile: (585) 477-1148

Enclosures: Transmittal Fee Sheet
Postcard